

## **Remarks**

Claims 1-12 are pending in the present application. Claims 1 and 7 stand rejected. Claims 2-6 and 8-12 are objected to. Claims 5, 6, 11 and 12 have been canceled. Claims 1 and 7 have been amended. Claims 13-20 are new.

### **I. New Claims**

New Claims 13-20 have been added to the present application and Applicants respectfully submit that support for each claim exists in the specification such that no new material has been added by these new claims.

Claim 13 is a combination of previous claim 1 and 6 and Claim 17 is a combination of previous claim 7 and 12. Previous dependent claims 6 and 12 were objected to, but would be allowed if they incorporated the base claim as per Examiners comments on page 2, paragraph 2 in the present office action.

Dependent claims 14-16 and 18-20 are identical to claims 2-4. Claims 14-16 depend on claim 13 and claims 18-20 depend on claim 17. Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are in condition for allowance and earnestly solicit the allowance of these claims.

### **II. Rejection of Claims 1 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)**

Claims 1 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 6,667,842 hereinafter "Comeau". Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent Claims 1 and 7 have now been amended so that the invention as claimed further defines the shunt resistance wherein the shunt resistance  $R_S$  is located on a substrate/slider for the read head. In light of the

amendment to independent claims 1 and 7, Comeau no longer discloses the invention substantially as claimed, and should not be rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Nowhere in Comeau does it disclose the situation where the shunt resistance is located on the substrate/slider as described above. This is confirmed by the Examiner's own admission in the present office action on page 2, paragraph 2. Examiner states that dependent claim 5 would be allowable if it incorporated base claim 1 and dependent claim 11 would be allowable if it incorporated base claim 7. Applicant has amended claim 1 to include the limitation of claim 5 and amended claim 7 to include the limitations of claim 11. Since Comeau fails to disclose the material element of the location of the shunt resistance on the substrate/slider, Comeau no longer anticipates independent claims 1 and 7 and applicant thus respectfully requests the withdrawal of this rejection under § 102(e).

Applicant has not discussed the rejections of the dependent claims because Applicant submits that the independent claim from which they respectively depend are in condition for allowance as set forth above. Applicant however reserves the right to address such rejections of the dependent claims should it become necessary.

### Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that all claims are in proper form and condition for patentability, and request a notification of allowance to that effect. The Examiner is hereby respectfully invited to contact the undersigned agent with any questions, comments or suggestions relating to this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Lin et al.

Date: 6/30/05 By: MSZ  
Matthew S. Zises (#47,246)  
Attorney for Applicants  
Hitachi Global Storage Technologies  
Intellectual Property Law  
5600 Cottle Road (NHGB/142)  
San Jose, CA 95193  
(408) 717-6759